



LP  
F  
5012  
1826  
P9







1826 TPB

AN  
**APOLOGY**

FOR THE

**CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE CANADAS,**

IN ANSWER TO

**A LETTER**

**TO THE EARL OF LIVERPOOL,**

RELATIVE TO

*The Rights of the Church of Scotland, &c. by a Protestant of the Church of Scotland.*

---

By A Protestant of the Established Church of England.

---

~~~~~  
O NAVIS ! REFERENT IN MARE TE NOVI  
FLUCTUS ?  
~~~~~

**KINGSTON.**

PRINTED BY JAMES MACFARLANE.

1826.

# THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PH.D. THESIS

BY

JOHN EDGAR WOOD

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1954

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

## AN APOLOGY

FOR THE

Church of England in British North America,

IN ANSWER TO

*A Letter to the Earl of Liverpool, relative to the Rights of the Church of Scotland, &c.—By a Protestant of the Church of Scotland.*

---

IT is with reluctance—a painful reluctance—that a Protestant of the Church of England at this time enters into the field of controversy, on the sacred and momentous subject of religion; but *again* our cause is assailed—again the “weapons of war” are brandished about us, and we must buckle on the armour of defence.

It is unkind enough, when those wilful and rebellious sons, who have wandered from the genial home and fostering protection of their Parent, endeavour, by every act of bitterness and rage, to “bring down those grey hairs in sorrow to the grave.” So it is with our Methodist brethren who have disturbed the peaceful communion of their maternal Church, by the clamours of enthusiasm and the madness of resentment: but they are the wayward children of passion, and we hope that yet the chastening hand of reason will sober down the wildness of that ferment, and restore them again, as penitent prodigals, to the home and the happiness they have left. But oh! it is base, when they to whom we have extended the

hand of fellowship ; whom we have regarded with esteem, and treated with honour, raise the sudden and angry cry of discontent and hatred, and strike at us with a concealed poignard steeped in the “gall of bitterness.” Unsuspicious of such treachery—unconscious of such malignity, we might well, with the assassinated Cæsar, forbear resistance, and wrap ourselves up the mantle of sorrow, with this pathetic reproof,

Tu quoque Brute !

We love not contention : yet, if attacked, we will defend—if misrepresented, we will explain—still, we desire no protraction of controversy—no continuance of hostility. We raise no *offensive* weapon, but merely ward off the missiles which hiss about us ; and having disarmed our adversary, then, with “good-will towards all men,” will we “go on our way rejoicing.”

I am concerned—but not for the cause I am proud of advocating—not for that pure and venerable Church, against whose strong foundation we trust the “gates of hell” will never prevail—but I am concerned that an effusion so bitter and acrimonious—so replete with prejudice and falsehood—so tinged with the petty spirit of jealousy, and the more wicked one of envy, hatred and malice—so ungenerous and so unjust, should have proceeded from the pen of a member of the Church of Scotland, as that “Letter to the Earl of Liverpool,” which I have just read, with the strongest feelings of compassion for its author, and of sorrow for the dismembered brotherhood of the Christian World.

Judging from the spirit which so manifestly pervades this whole performance, I would readily pronounce it the last efforts of a desperate cause—the convulsive agonies of a dying struggle. It is not



long since the claims which form the subject of this "letter," were first proposed; and in the beginning, they were offered with timidity, and pleaded with modesty. Hardly conscious that *right* gave any sanction to their expectations, they implored assistance as a *favour*: by degrees, however, they waxed bolder, and the glimmering hope of success begotten, I fear, by cupidity; nurtured, perhaps, by a misplaced confidence in the undistinguishing liberality of the age, and furthered by the loud clamours against order and establishment so vehemently put forth by the school of the Broughams and the Benthamites, and so warmly seconded by the statesmen of Cockaigne and the dusky halo of the Edinburgh Reviewers, changed the cautious tones of "*Quid tentare nocebit*" into the loudest language of confidence, and the loftiest breathings of defiance. But the attempt, as the event has proved, was attended with very indifferent success. Wisdom and expediency raised their voices against them; and law and equity confirmed the decisions of propriety. Now, as a final endeavour, the present appeal, compounded of ignorance and arrogance, is boldly made. Not satisfied with proposing their wishes, and explaining their rights, they asperse and vilify the Church of England in the Canadas: the passion of desire has been fretted by disappointment, and here we are presented with the strongest bursts of indignation, and the undisguised workings of envy.

"Pectora felle virent; lingua est suffusa veneno."

How such an address to the Earl of Liverpool—a nobleman of pre-eminent rectitude, and of conspicuous attachment to the Established Church of his country—will be received, every person who will believe others susceptible of similar feelings with those which an impartial view of the present pamph-

let would naturally excite, will be at no loss to conjecture.

The author of the present "Letter," after displaying much trite research on the meaning of the word *Protestant*, proceeds to a comment upon certain clauses of the Act of the 31st of the late King, which grants the well-known appropriation of one-seventh of the lands of this Province to the maintenance of a "Protestant Clergy;" and arrives at the conclusion that the provisions contained therein, give no exclusive claim to the Clergy of the *Church of England*. But, however logical this inference might be deemed in those ages when the "divine art" was adored, it is now considered at least unfair to suppress a part of the *premises* from which a *conclusion* is drawn. In reciting various clauses, to his remarks upon which those who were unacquainted with the context might perhaps yield a ready assent, why did he omit the 38th clause, which, even to those of very moderate acquaintance with the ecclesiastical usages of England, would very materially weaken the force of his deductions from the extracts he had made?

"Nothing *extenuate*; nor set down aught in malice."

But to make a logical deduction from the *whole* of the premises, let us revert again to the clauses of the Act which this writer has quoted. The 36th clause *provides* for the support and maintenance of "a Protestant Clergy" within the Canadas, by making an "allotment and appropriation" for that purpose, of one-seventh of the lands granted by the Crown. Hitherto there had been no such provision, and the Clergy of the Church of Rome alone had held and enjoyed certain dues and rights.

The 37th clause enacts that all the rents and profits arising from such lands so "*allotted and appropriated*" as aforesaid, shall be applicable *solely* to the

maintenance and support of a Protestant Clergy within" these Provinces.

The 38th clause enacts, that His Majesty may authorize the Governor or person administering the Government within each Province, "to constitute and erect, within every Township or Parish, which now is, or hereafter may be formed, constituted, or erected, within such Province, one or more Parsonage or Rectory or Parsonages or Rectories, according to the *establishment of the Church of England*; and from *time to time*, by instrument under the Great Seal of such Province, to endow every such Parsonage or Rectory with *somuch* or such a part of the lands *so allotted and appropriated* as aforesaid," as the Governor and Executive Council shall "judge to be expedient under the then existing circumstances of such Township or Parish."

Now, what is the meaning of these *three* clauses taken in conjunction, and so indeed they must be taken? The 36th clause *allots and appropriates*: the 37th confines the *rents and profits* arising from the lands so "allotted and appropriated," *solely* to the maintenance and support of a Protestant Clergy," in contradistinction to those of the Church of Rome: and the 38th clause *defines who the Protestant Clergy are*, to whom that appropriation shall be given by way of endowment. The conclusion, therefore, is irresistible: that \* "a preference is given to the Church of England"—that an "exclusion is made of all other Churches—and that the Church of England is "named," and not by "inference," but in express words, and with all the technicalities, such as Parsonages, Rectories, &c. which appertain to that Church and to that Church only. 'Twere passing strange that, if any other denomina-

---

\* Vide Letter, page 8.

tion of Protestants were meant, their zealous advocates should have left their hope of future provision and support to the uncertainty of a vague word—and that Mr. Fox, in the ardour of his opposition, and Mr. Dundas, in his meritorious love for “the Clergy of his native country,” should have permitted this distinct and unequivocal appropriation to the Church of England, and have made *no mention* of the Kirk of Scotland. Then, had it been the “*intention* of Parliament” to include the latter in the provision for which that seventh was appropriated, it was at least an oversight unworthy of that most learned and acute body, to say not a word of Presbyterians or Scotland, of Synods, Sessions or Assemblies, when they were so explicit in regard to the Establishment of the Church of England—Parsonages, Rectories, Endowments and Inductions. It was a *sin of omission* which the present generation must charge upon their fathers—and not of *commission* to fasten upon the Established Church of the Canadas : they may lament the indifference of that long-gone Parliament to their welfare and their rights ; but they ought not to pounce with unsparing avidity upon the inheritance which Law has given to another, nor convert the breathings of sorrow and disappointment, into the tones of menace and defiance.

But if the word “ Protestant ” be a vague one, and thence productive of dispute and difficulty ; the word “ CLERGY ” has, in this case, a more exclusive meaning than perhaps occurred to our Pamphleteer ; and perhaps it will startle him to be informed that, in the laws and Constitution of *England*, it is only applicable to that which the above Act seems to have meant—the *establishment of the Church of England*. Search the Statute books, ransack every fragment of law and legislation, and then deny, if possible, that

the term "Clergy" when associated or not with the word "Protestant," is in England never *legally* applied to any other than the Church of England. It is derived from the word "Clerus" which, in law, signifies the assembly or body of *Clerks* or Ecclesiastics. And by the word "Clergy" is now comprehended "Archbishops, Bishops, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, Rural Deans, Parsons, (who are either Rectors or Vicars) and Curates."<sup>(a)</sup> And the word "Clerk" is derived from "Clericus," the law term for a Clergyman, and by which term all of them who have not taken a degree, are designated in Deeds, &c. And for the further information of our author, I beg to add, that in the early ages, as the "*Clergy* in particular then engrossed almost every other branch of learning, so (like their predecessors the British Druids) they were peculiarly remarkable for their proficiency in the study of the law. *Nullus clericus nisi causidicus*, is the character given of them soon after the conquest by William of Malmsbury. The Judges, therefore, were usually created out of this sacred order, as was likewise the case among the Normans; and all the inferior offices were supplied by the Lower Clergy, which has occasioned their successors to be nominated *Clerks* to this day."<sup>(b)</sup> "Thus much of the *Clergy* properly so called."<sup>(c)</sup> And it will perhaps be found, then, that the *Lord Chancellor* of England as well as the *First Lord of the Treasury* would, in this case, be appealed to in vain for a subversion of both Law and Equity. Such being the meaning of the word "Clergy" in England, we must of course submit to such definition, as we are not to apply to the Courts

---

(a) Co. Lit. 94, a. 1 Black. Com. cap. 11, Burns' Ec. Law.

(b) Co. Lit. 304, b. 1 Com. 17.

(c) 1 Com. 394.

of Law in *Scotland* for the meaning of an *English* word ; and more particularly, as we, in this Province, boast of living under the Constitution and Laws of England.

Our author, after the self-satisfying conclusion of his syllogism from the Act of the 31st of the late King, makes some allusion to the "*intention* of Parliament"(a) as collected from the debates in the House of Commons at the passing of that Act ; but that, I am sorry for his sake, rather makes *against* than *for* the cause he is advocating. With regard to the speech of Mr. Fox cited by our author, I see not wherein it expresses any such *intention* as our writer would fain collect from it. Mr. Fox, in that *insulated* speech, objected first, that so large an appropriation as one-seventh of the lands should be made to a *Protestant Clergy* in a *Catholic country* : (We will admit with our author that the "Kirk was included" amongst Protestant dissenters) and then he says, in terms of implied disapprobation, that "they were therefore going to give to *dissenters* one-seventh of all the lands in the Province." Whatever may have been the *intention* of Mr. Fox, we can gather nothing specially in favour of the Kirk, from his *language* ! On the contrary, he seems to mean that, by so large and *indiscriminate* a provision the Clergy of the Kirk as well as other dissenters would have larger incomes in Canada than in Scotland or in any other part of Europe ; and this would overthrow the boast of Mr. Dundas, "that the security of the Kirk of Scotland was its being erected on the *rock of poverty*." But this is *now* deemed too flinty a source whence to glean the harvest of ecm-

---

(a) Vide Letter, page 9.

fort and wealth ; and in these degenerate days, honest poverty is preceded by daring rapine.

O cives, cives, quærenda pecunia primum est ;  
Virtus post nummos.

But as our author has appealed to the "*intention* of Parliament" as collected from the *debates* in the House of Commons, (why did he *suppress* any part of them ?) let us hear the language of Mr. PITT, at that time the Minister ; inasmuch as the *intention* of him who planned, advised and matured the said Act, ought to govern us, rather than the language of Mr. Fox, who seems to have opposed the ministry merely for the sake of opposition.

Mr. Pitt (House of Commons, 12th May, 1791) (a) said that he first gave the Government and Council, a power, under the instructions of His Majesty, to distribute out of a sum arising from the tythes for lands or possessions, and set apart for the maintenance and support of the Protestant Clergy, &c.—and the second clause, he said, provided for the permanent support of the Protestant Clergy, a seventh portion of the lands to be granted in future. He declared that the *meaning of the Act* was to enable the Governor to endow and to present the Protestant Clergy of the *Established Church* to such *Parsonage* or *Rectory* as might be constituted or erected within every Township or Parish, which now was or might be formed ; and to give to such Protestant Clergyman of the *Established Church*, a part or the *whole*, as the Governor thought proper, of the lands appropriated by the Act. He further explained, that this was done to *encourage* the *Established Church*, and that possibly hereafter it might be proposed to send a *Bishop* of the *Established Church* to sit in the Legislative Council."

---

(a) Vidé Parl. Reg. vol. 29, pp. 414—415.

Now, what other than the Established Church of *England* was here meant? What other Protestant Church than the Church of England recognizes Parsonages, Rectories and Bishops? And if the Governor according to the power given him by the Act, "thought proper" to bestow the "*whole*" of the lands thus appropriated, what would be left for other Protestants? When it is discovered that a *part* of those lands is sufficient for fulfilling the intention of the Act, then it will be time enough for the Kirk of Scotland to *crave* but not to *claim* the superfluity. That the aforesaid clauses for the support of the Episcopal Clergymen have not been act-upon(*a*) certainly takes away nothing from their right and title to that appropriation, when it may be found advisable to make the use of it originally intended. If a man chooses not to apply a certain portion of his means and resources to his daily expenditure, it does not follow that every pauper who may clamour for aid has a *right* to demand what is thus seemingly dormant and superfluous. With regard to the "Reserves" it was thought more advisable, in order to carry the intention of that provision into effect, to *lease* them and to apply the rents and profits thereof as the Governor was authorised to do by the 37th clause. The reasons for the adoption of the latter course, were, I apprehend—1. Because at the time of passing this Act, the population of the Province was so small and so scattered that it was impossible to ascertain, with any precision, the real value of lands. 2. Because the emoluments arising from such lands at that time, were so small, that a Clergyman could not obtain a subsistence from his portion, unless he himself performed the labours of a husbandman. 3. Because

---

(*a*) Vide Letter, page 11.



the Provincial Government were unable to form any idea of the density of the future population, and consequently, had a division been made at that time, many townships when thickly settled would have been inadequately provided for. And 4. Because had a division been made, the Clergy might therefore have been deprived of the present allowance granted to them from "the funds of the liberal society which now supports them."

From sec. 41 of the aforesaid Act, I cannot at this late period join in the inferences of our Author, (a) any more than I can yield to the persuasion that the Legislature have *now* a better right, from the special provisos in this clause, to grant this allotment of land to the Kirk of Scotland, than to dispose of it for the building of Court Houses or the mending of roads. For although there be no enactment in *positive terms*, "excluding the Church of Scotland from part of the profits of the Clergy Reserves," does it follow that if you give to A. and do not *expressly exclude* his brother B. that B. is, on that account, entitled to the whole or any part of the inheritance already disposed of? That may be a specimen of his metaphysics—but neither law, nor justice, will countenance or support such "colours of reasoning, adduced with boldness and art."(b)

The "attempt to shew that the Clergy of the religion established in Scotland have a legal birth-right claim to part of the profits arising from the Clergy Reserves in Canada"(c) does not seem to me crowned with the triumphant success which the citation of two of the articles of the Act of Union would seem to give it. If the Imperial Parliament—

---

(a) Vide Letter, page 13.

(b) See Letter, p. 4.

(c) Ibid, p. 14.

a Parliament at that time composed of members from *Scotland* as well as from England—bestow a seventh of the disposable lands of Canada for the maintenance of the Established Clergy of England within that Colony, surely the mere Act of Union cannot annul that enactment. Their birthright privileges will hardly avail them in procuring a possession, which the Parliament has otherwise disposed of.

Jactes et genus et nomen inutile.

As well indeed, might they insist that by the Act of Union the *Scotch Laws* should be introduced into these Provinces and there be “unalterably secured,” (a) inasmuch as certain emigrants “from the North of the Tweed” might prefer the institutions to which early habit had attached them. If there be an absurdity in such a supposition, no less absurd is the idea of two religious *Establishments* within the same Province. Such cannot subsist for a more striking reason perhaps, than that the “Earth cannot bear two Suns.” And if there *must* be but one, it is at least reasonable that the dominant Church of the Empire should be the Established Church of its Colonies. (b)

But when law and justice cannot avail our author—for neither is on his side—then there is a bold resort to the grossest libel upon “Episcopacy”—to the most shameful misrepresentation of the Church of England in the Canadas. Failing in the attempt to *steal our purse*, he would fain *filch from us our good name*.

“Flectere, si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo.”

I am unwilling to detract from the real merits of any community or individual—nor am I disposed to doubt,

(a) Vide Act of Union, and Letter, p. 5.

(b) Vide the address to the Lord Bishop of Quebec, from the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Quebec.

that the highest benefits have resulted from the zealous labours of the Scottish Clergy and Schoolmasters in their own Country. Neither shall I deny that the same might be effected *here*—but why do they calumniate their sister Church, and on what grounds do they hazard the bold assertion that “Episcopacy *alone* can never produce such results ; for the *genius* of Episcopacy is in opposition to the genius of the people ?” (a) What ! Episcopacy incapable of rendering the “poor, ignorant, idle and wicked,—comfortable, enlightened, industrious and moral !” Is no such influence visible, for instance, in England ; or is it in Scotland alone that the lower orders receive the benefits of religious instruction, and enjoy the consolations of Christian hope ? What ! “the genius of Episcopacy in opposition to the genius of the people !” It is not at least in opposition to the genius of that glorious fabric—THE CONSTITUTION OF GREAT BRITAIN—and the genius of the latter is not in opposition to the genius of its subjects. But I deny, unequivocally deny the fact—and confidently say and can prove, that the Church of England is, in this country, generally popular, wherever it has been for any time planted—and I think I can safely add, that it is *more* popular, amongst those who have had no strong previous bias, or, to use the language of our author, amongst “neutrals,” than the Church of Scotland. There are many too (and our Pamphleteer cannot deny it,) who, having once been members of the Church of Scotland, and with no other possible motive than conscience or inclination to influence their choice, have incorporated themselves within the Church of England ; and although they may at first have joined it from necessity, yet, when they had an opportunity of returning to the communion of

---

(a) Vide Letter, p. 16.

their fathers, we find they did not so, but continued to adhere, with firm and fervent affection, to the tenets and usages of Episcopacy. Surely, then, Episcopacy was not in opposition to *their* genius. But what shall we say of the accordance of *Presbyterianism* with the genius of the same people, when no such instance can be produced on *its* side—that any member of the Church of England has, under similar circumstances, joined and adhered to the Communion of the Kirk of Scotland?

“That the members of the Church of Scotland resident in the North American Provinces,” (a) are the *least numerous* of all Protestants therein, is “generally admitted,” and can easily be proved; and I readily believe that the “verified numbers of each were *not* procured” by this writer. In Upper Canada, of the Ecclesiastical Establishment of which he takes so partial a notice, there are TWENTY-SIX Clergymen of the Church of England, exclusive of Military Chaplains, most or all of whom, have two, and many three or four distinct congregations within the neighbourhood of the particular portion of the country to which they have been appointed—so that there are perhaps, from fifty to sixty congregations in this Province, many of them numerous, and all respectable, who are accustomed to the usages, and prefer the services and doctrines of the Church of England. But on the other hand, there are but four or five ministers of the Kirk of Scotland in this Province—gentlemen highly respectable, zealous and worthy, I will grant—and they are planted where the members of their Communion are most numerous—where, indeed, with some trifling exceptions, they are *only* to be found.

With regard to the representations concerning

---

(a) Vide Letter, p. 17.

Bellville and Bath (a) I had the strongest reason to reject them as wholly unfounded ; and I am happy to find that the gentleman who is at the head of the former Congregation has exposed such misstatement as it deserves. He shows in a manner which cannot be denied, that his congregation *averages* from 70 to 100 persons, that when the weather is fine it exceeds 150 ; and that the Episcopal Church erected in Bellville is not more than adequate to the accommodation of those who generally frequent it. Besides, in contradiction to the representation in the aforesaid " Letter," this Reverend Gentleman plainly states that the number of his communicants, instead of 16, amounts annually to 35 or 40. And it may be worthy of observation that whilst 25 of the latter reside within a mile of their Church, many of those who make up the boasted amount of 114 communicants in the Scotch Church of Kingston (which is a town containing upwards of 3,000 inhabitants) came from various and distant parts of the Province. The Protestant population of Bellville is stated to be under 400 souls.

" It is *stated* that Methodism prevails among the people"—it does, indeed, too widely—and that "Episcopacy, which made no progress when not opposed, is now unable to withstand the assaults of Sectarians, supported by the favour of the people." Who *stated* this ? Forsooth, the presumptuous author of a calumnious letter to the Earl of Liverpool ! To ascertain the real progress of "Episcopacy" in this country, read the Annual reports of the Society for the propagation of the Gospel—traverse the country—and contrast the present state of the Church of England in Canada with its condition ten years ago—and then will the bold propagator of

---

(a) Letter p. 17.

such a statement, blush for his illiberality and incorrectness.

I have no doubt an "active and pious ministry" might do much for the Church of Scotland in the wide and unprovided wastes of Canada. They might "make proselytes of neutrals"—but as for "fixing those who waver betwixt Episcopacy and fanaticism," I know not what the author really means. We might readily infer, from his manner of speaking, that the one is as much to be abhorred as the other—that both are extremes in religion, betwixt which the active and zealous ministers of the Kirk would fix the wavering, on the common and safe principle, I suppose, of

" Inter utrumque tene—  
—medio tulissimus ibis."

I know not how he means to make the comparison apply, or how to support the contrast—but this much I do know, that it is daring language to address to Lord Liverpool, an Englishman, and a member of the Church of England.

But "we have not done yet,"

" Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo ?"

In proposing to his countrymen North of the Tweed the means of obtaining the fancied rights of the Church of Scotland in Canada, he unhappily falls into two or three palpable contradictions. In pages 13 and 14 there is given the 41st clause of the British Act touching this subject, and in the margin the writer has remarked that the Provincial Legislature *may* alter this allotment of land—but in the 19th page, he says, that our Legislature *have not power* to abrogate the national rights of the Church of Scotland. Now, the argument throughout is founded on those *national rights* ; for it is introduced in the 5th page with an extract from the Articles

of Union—and in the 16th page, he speaks of the “expediency of obtaining from His Majesty’s Government the *rights of their National Church.*” This is a blowing of hot and cold with the same breath, which might shock one of less simplicity than the guileless satyr.

In the “second objection,” page 19th, the sudden approbation of the House of Assembly—the loud boast of their “*knowledge and liberality,*” contrasted with the declaration a little before, that the “Legislature of Upper Canada either *do not understand or disregard* the rights of the Church of Scotland”—compels me, though reluctantly, because not more universally applicable to the Scotch than to any other nation, (although in this *individual* instance they are peculiarly so) to repeat the words of Junius to Lord Mansfield, “I own, I am not apt to confide in the professions of gentlemen of *that* country, and when they smile, I feel an involuntary emotion to guard myself against mischief.”

But it is time to conclude——We are sorry—heartily sorry—that there should have been any cause for this discussion ; but we comfort ourselves with the assurance that it comes unsought—that *we* have not been the aggressors. When, by the influence and exertions of the late illustrious Bishop of Quebec, the Clergy of the Church of England in the Canadas were respectively formed into a Corporation for the superintendence and management of that “munificent appropriation” which had been originally designed for their “encouragement” and support—no voice was raised against that proceeding—there was not then, on their own parts, or in the conceits of any others, the shadow of a doubt regarding their exclusive claim to that provision. But suddenly—when the exertions of the corporations

began to have some influence upon that long-neglected appropriation—when new lots were daily leased and the number of applicants was multiplying—when better regulations began to be adopted for collecting their dues, and they promised a future harvest worthy the culture and the pains—then the Church of Scotland look upon them with a covetous eye, and inwardly grieve at the contemplation of the glorious spoil.

“ Videt ingratos, intabescit que videndo  
Successus hominum.”

The spirit of the age was *liberal*—the voice of opposition was loud against establishment and order—the Canadas were too little known and too much neglected—and there was hope that ministers would yield the contest without a struggle. But hope is deceitful, and that hope was deceived. The Church of England did not tamely look upon this infringement—they protested—they remonstrated—petition was met by petition—explanation was counteracted by explanation. And if that Church has been strenuous in her own cause—if she has put forth all her might in her own defence—must she be accused of “greediness and intolerance?” (a) Because she would provide, with tender care, for the infant Establishment she has formed—because she would secure respectability and support to her ministers, and consolation and happiness to her members in future ages—because she would strengthen the ties of attachment to our CONSTITUTION and our Country—because she would labour for the welfare of the MONARCH we reverence, whilst she would advance the glory of the GOD whom we adore—must she, in this glow of her pious zeal, accompanied with the

---

(a) See Letter, p. 14.



most affectionate breathings of "good will towards all men" be accused of rapine and fraud?

The British Government are not to be imposed upon by clamorous petitions and false representations on the one part, any more than by "inflated statements" on the other. The British Government *do* know the state of the case—they know that the Church of England has done much in this country for the cause of religion and loyalty—and they are well assured that the "genius of Episcopacy is *not* in opposition to the genius of the people." The British Government and *nation* will not abandon the infant Church *they* have planted in these Provinces—and if they do not cherish and support it with a more liberal hand, they will, at least, defend its interests and guard its rights.

Sincerely rejoiced would I be if the British Government did also extend their munificence to the Church of Scotland in these Provinces, and aid them in the glorious work of promoting the joys of religion and the blessings of unity, peace and concord amongst their inhabitants. I would hail the day with gladness when some provision was made for their permanent and respectable support—for they are *an* Established Church of the Empire—but I would lament the subversion of justice and right—the violation of the precepts of wisdom—and contempt of the suggestions of expediency, did the British government apportion to them the property of the Church of England, and make any other than *that*

THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF THE CANADAS.

As their fellow-labourers in the cause of "righteousness and truth," the Clergy of the Established Church, will, I dare be responsible, gladly proffer to them the hand of fellowship, and give them the hearts of brothers. They will co-operate with cheer-

ful cordiality, in the work of holiness ; and aid them in every project for the relief of the distressed, the comfort of the afflicted, the awakening of the lukewarm, the instruction of the ignorant, and the salvation of all.

**FINIS.**







